

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Applicants respectfully present herewith replacement Figures 6A, 6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 which include the desired changes, without markings, and which comply with §1.84. The changes made to Figures 6A, 6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 are explained in the accompanying remarks section below.

## **REMARKS**

By this submission accompanying with a request for continued examination, claims 17, 22, 24, 26, 33, 34, 39, 41, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 66-68, 70-75 and 78-80 are amended. Claims 48, 65 and 69 are canceled. No new matter is contained in the amendments. Accordingly, claims 17-47, 49-64, 66-68, and 70-80 are pending in this application and are respectfully submitted for a timely examination.

### **Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 40, 42-47 and 56-64.

Claim 41 has been amended to obviate the objection to the claim, and is now in compliance with U.S. patent practice. Claim 41 depends from allowed claim 40 and therefore, claim 41 should also be allowed.

Applicants further appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 49-55. It is submitted that each of claims 49-55 has been amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 48. Thus, each of claims 49-55 should be allowed.

### **Drawings**

The drawings were objected to because Figs. 6A-6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 were recommended to be labeled as -- Related Art --. Applicants respectfully submit replacement Figs. 6A-6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 labeled as -- Related Art --, yet the Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position that these Figures are "old."

As clearly explained in the Applicants' response dated April 29, 2005, in which the contents are incorporated herein by reference in its entirety, each of Figs. 6A-6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 illustrates subject matter that is RELATED to the present invention

but does NOT illustrates subject matter that is old. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Figs. 6A-6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17 is NOT old and is NOT admitted to be prior art.

Hence, the Applicants request approval of the drawing changes, and the objection to be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 22, 26, 33, 39, 41, 48, 56 and 80 are objected to as containing some minor informalities. Claims 22, 26, 33, 39, 41, 48, 56 and 80 have been amended to obviate this rejection. Thus, withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

### **Claims 17-39 and 65-80 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph**

Claims 17-39 and 65-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that the claimed subject matter recited in each of the claims are fully supported in the disclosure of the present application.

As claim 65 is canceled, the rejection of this claim is now moot.

The Applicants submit that claims 17-19 are directed to a signal transmission system, and claims 20-39, 66-68 and 70-80 are directed to a semiconductor memory device. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited in claims 17-19 and 66-68, 70-80 correspond to, for instance, to the 12<sup>th</sup> embodiment of the present invention. In particular, the 12<sup>th</sup> embodiment of the present invention are illustrated in Figures 56-69, and are discussed on page 66, line 12 through page 73, line 20. Specifically, the 12<sup>th</sup> embodiment of the present invention discloses an example of high-speed data write in a dynamic random-access memory (DRAM) using a separated

sense amplifier, and is different from the conventional DRAM due to the control circuit for the bit line transfer gate connecting the sense amplifier to its associated bit line. Hence, the Applicants submit that the structural limitations as well as the functional limitations as recited in claims 17-19 and 66-68, 70-80 are fully supported in the disclosure to enable comply with the enable requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**Claims 24-26, 29-30, 34, 48-55 and 74 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph**

Claims 24-26, 29-30, 34, 48-55 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Applicants submit that these claims have been amended to obviate the rejection, and therefore are in compliance with U.S. patent practice.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

**Claims 17-19, 65 and 69 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 17-19, 65 and 69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Akiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,335, hereinafter "Akiyama").

Claims 65 and 69 have been canceled, and therefore the rejection of these claims are now moot.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter claim 20 (see below under Pending Claims) and therefore claim 17 is also allowable.

As claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17, the Applicants submit that each of these claims incorporates the patentable aspects therein, and is therefore allowable for

at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claim, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

**Claim 48 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurtze et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,083).

Claim 48 has been canceled and therefore, the rejection of this claim is now moot.

**Pending Claims 20-39, 66-68, 70-80**

The Applicants submit that each of claims 20-39, 66-68 and 70-80 contains allowable subject matter since the Office Action failed to set forth any basis for a prior art rejection of these claims.

Claim 65 was rejected based on prior art. Claim 65 has been canceled. However, each of claims 66-68 and 70-80 has been amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 65. Therefore, each of claims 20-39, 66-68 and 70-80 is allowable.


**Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request a timely allowance of the present application.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 100021-00033.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang  
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

Enclosures: Replacement Figures 6A, 6B, 7B, 8-12 and 15-17